DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 741 JC 760 060

AUTHOR Cowley, W. H.
TITLE The Emergence of the Junior College in the Evolution of American Education: A Memorandum for the Fund for the Advancement of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 10 Sep 55
NOTE 61p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Colleges; *Educational History; *Junior Colleges; Post Secondary Education; Professional Education; *Secondary Schools; *Universities

ABSTRACT

In an effort to elucidate the forces behind the emergence of the American junior college, this document reviews the evolution of the structure of American education from 1874 to 1921. The historical review begins with 1874 because the decision made that year in the Kalamazoo Case confirmed the right of communities to support high schools by taxation. It ends with 1921 because two pivotal events occurred in that year: first, the organization of the American Association of Junior Colleges, and second, the establishment of the first unitary two-year junior college, namely, Modesto Junior College in Modesto, California. It reviews the historical development of secondary schools, liberal arts colleges, professional schools, universities, and junior colleges in that time period. The author concludes that the junior college of today is an historical accident. A bibliography is appended. (DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116741

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE EMERGENCE OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

IN THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

A Memorandum for the Fund for the

Advancement of Education

W. H. Cowley
Stanford University
September 10, 1955

JC 760 060

P R E F A C E

ERIC has reproduced this slightly amended memorandum of 1955 at the suggestion of my long-time friend, B. Lamar Johnson, UCLA Professor Emeritus of Higher Education. We first met during the 'Thirties when, a young and devoted colleague of President James Madison Wood of Stephens College, he held the dual post of Dean of Instruction and Librarian. I got to know both men in the course of several visits to Stephens arranged by my chief, Dr. W. W. Charters, Director of the Ohio State University Bureau of Educational Research. Back in 1912 Dr. Charters, then Dean of Education at the University of Missouri, had persuaded Wood to take over the direction of Stephens, then about to go bankrupt. The Wood-Charters team prevented that impending catastrophe, and Dr. Charters continued to be President Wood's educational advisor for the next thirty-five years.

On my several visits to Stephens I got to know President Wood well and, further, increasingly to admire his extraordinary achievements. Thus after his retirement in 1947 I suggested to Dr. Alvin C. Eurich of the Ford Foundation, an old friend and former associate, that it would be a deplorable blunder to allow President Wood to pass from the scene before some one got him to review his gargantuan career. He agreed and commissioned me to get President Wood's consent to record his reminiscences on tape.

The idea pleased him, and on several occasions during 1954-55 Dr. Wood and I met at the Hotel Biltmore in New York, his residence since his retirement, at Stephens, and here in Palo Alto on trips to visit his son, James Madison Wood, Jr., a Stanford graduate student in the History Department.

At the end of the taping sessions I sent a summary of the project to Dr. Eurich, and that led him to suggest that I undertake a further study, namely, that I make available to him and his Ford Fund associates what I had learned about the rise and

potentials of junior colleges. He knew that for a decade my graduate students and I had been investigating the structural evolution of American education, and hence he further proposed that I interrelate junior colleges with other structures ranging from the colleges and academies rooted in the colonial period to the flourishing graduate and professional schools of the mid-20th century. I welcomed the idea, and this memorandum, written as requested "with all due speed" during the summer of 1955, is its product.

Palo Alto, California
January 23, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface		i
Foreward		iv

CHAPTERS

ONE:	The Junior College, An Historical Accident	1
TWO:	The Evolving Structure of American Education, 1874-1921	4
THREE:	The Three American University Plans	18
FOUR:	The Four Historical Foci of the Junior College	35

APPENDICES

ONE:	French and German University Structuring	50
TWO:	Sources Employed	51
THREE:	A Semantic Note	54

FOREWARD

In an address at the 1915 meeting of the North Central Association Dean James Rowland Angell of the University of Chicago put into circulation an expression which soon became a slogan, namely, "the Junior College Movement." Nineteen years earlier President William Rainey Harper of the same university had coined the name "'junior college' . . . to cover the work of the freshman and sophomore years." Later he wrote that he had chosen it "for lack of a better term," but it took hold and spread so rapidly that by 1915 Dean Angell could refer to the resulting Junior College Movement. This memorandum reviews its rise and early progress.

CHAPTER ONE

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE, AN HISTORICAL ACCIDENT

> An accident is an event happening unexpectedly and without fault.
>
> Thomas M. Cooley, 1879.

Because William Rainey Harper invented the name "the junior college," writers of the history of the junior college movement frequently refer to him as "the father of the junior college." Had Harper lived to see the appearance and growth of the two-year unitary colleges which today the name chiefly denotes, he probably would deny his alleged fatherhood. Before enlarging upon this statement I must clarify what I mean by a two-year unitary college.

Of the 598 junior colleges listed in the 1955 Junior College Directory published by the American Association of Junior Colleges, 560 are two-year structures. Twenty-seven of the other 38 continue for four years, and three for three years. Eight are one-year colleges. Structurally the 560 two-year institutions fall into two categories: those attached to high schools and usually housed in high school buildings, and those which have no organic ties to high schools and which are therefore independent or unitary.

I can find no information in the Junior College Directory or elsewhere about how many of the 560 two-year junior colleges fall in each of these groups, but I estimate that about four hundred or approximately seventy per cent of them are unitary. This estimate may be off a bit in either direction, but I submit that in the public mind a junior college predominately means a two-year unitary structure. Beyond question this variety of structure enrolls the great majority of junior college students.

To return to William Rainey Harper. He believed that the freshman and sophomore years of the historic American College should be pushed back into the secondary schools, but he had no notion that they would be set apart in two-year unitary structures. Until 1903 he advocated a six-year high school, but during the last several years of his life he accepted the emerging idea that the period of secondary education should consist of two three-year units. It seems clear that he never desired or even imagined that unitary, two-year junior colleges would appear. When he died in 1906, none had.

Junior college historians also refer to Henry Philip Tappan, president of the University of Michigan from 1852 to 1863, and to William W. Folwell, president of the University of Minnesota from 1869 to 1884, as progenitors of junior colleges; but, like Harper, they did not propose or even contemplate the unitary two-year junior colleges of today. They, too, conceived of a reconstructed educational system which would include a six-year secondary school similar to the German gymnasium.

If Harper, Tappan, and Folwell, the three educators most frequently credited with sponsoring junior colleges, did not recommend or even encourage the establishment of the two-year structures of today, then who did? For years I have been trying to find the answer to this question, and I have been unable to elude the conclusion that unanticipated forces beyond the control of those who proposed that American education be structurally reformed pushed it into unforeseen if not undesired patterns. Otherwise expressed, the unitary junior college of today is an historical accident.

I do not make this statement in an antagonistic spirit. I am on record in print as a friend of the junior college movement, and everyone knows that some of the mose desirable things in life have happened accidentally, that is,

unexpectedly. I characterize the junior college as an historical accident because I can find no nineteenth or early twentieth century educational reformer who planned it, anticipated it, or wanted it. It just appeared, and as a student of American higher education I am interested in discovering why.

This, may I emphasize, is not an antiquarian interest. During recent years the number of junior colleges has decreased, and the most cherished hopes of some junior college people -- notably the 6-4-4 plan -- have run into heavy water. These present troubles may be indicators of even greater difficulties ahead. A better understanding of the origins of the junior college movement will, I believe, more clearly illuminate both the present and the outlines of the future.

CHAPTER TWO

THE EVOLVING STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN EDUCATION, 1874-1921

Nothing ever is but is always becoming.

Plato

Almost everyone has seen photographs of individuals whose feet, hands, or faces have been closer to the camera than the rest of their bodies with the result that they stand forth in ludicrous proportions. A comparable phenomenon often occurs in the writing of history. The historian gets so close to his subject that he puts it out of focus with its background if not, indeed, with parts of the subject itself. All the histories of the junior college movement that I have read exhibit some degree of such distortion. For this, however, their authors cannot be blamed any more than can the authors of the histories of individual colleges and universities which, in The Growth of the American Republic, Morison and Commager have pronounced a scandal to American scholarship.

All who write the history of any segment of education must depend upon the general historians of education both for background knowledge and for help in posing their subjects. The general historians, however, have failed them. To date, for example, no adequate history of American higher education has been written, and none of those in print deals satisfactorily with the evolution of American educational structures.

When the greatly needed structural history of American education comes to be written, it will probably emphasize at least two points about the junior college movement: first, that it got under way concurrently with several other robust structural developments and, second, that it found itself encircled by older movements which still had considerable momentum. In any case, before the

rise of the junior college can be described, the structural developments of the period beginning in 1874 and ending in 1921 must be examined.

I start with 1874 because the decision made that year in the Kalamazoo Case confirmed the right of communities to support high schools by taxation, and I conclude with 1921 because two pivotal events occurred in that year: first, the organization of the American Association of Junior Colleges and, second, the establishment of the first unitary two-year junior college that I have been able to discover, namely, the Modesto Junior College in Modesto, California.

The structural pattern of American education has, of course, continued to change since 1921; but the rate of change has been considerably slower than during the forty-seven years now to be canvassed. The decisions then made have definitively shaped the present and will continue for a long period to influence the future. I review them in turn for secondary schools, liberal arts colleges, professional schools, and universities.

The developments in the first three of these four units will be summarized in this present chapter, but the fourth requires such protracted attention that I devote the next chapter to it. Neither includes much about junior colleges, but they prepare the ground for a more thorough understanding of the junior college movement than is possible, I believe, without the background facts they exhibit.

Secondary Education

In 1850 the secondary schools called academies -- all of them fee-charging -- numbered 6,085 and enrolled 263,096 pupils. Public high schools were so few that no record seems to exist of their numbers until 1860 when 231, enrolling an

unknown number of pupils, had come upon the educational scene. By 1890, however, the situation had changed phenomenally: the academies had been reduced to a quarter of their 1850 total -- to 1,632 -- and their enrollees to 94,931. Meanwhile public high schools had increased eight times to 2,521 and served 202,963 pupils.

Many factors entered into this change of control of secondary education, but the chief consideration seems to have been the Kalamazoo decision. State after state followed the Michigan precedent, their courts usually citing it when called upon for rulings. Private entrepreneurs, towns, municipalities, and the majority of colleges and universities operated academies; but most of them appear to have been controlled by religious denominations.

The decision in the Kalamazoo Case apparently convinced the great bulk of Protestants that secondary, like elementary, education should be under the aegis of the civil authorities. Public schools have therefore prodigiously increased in numbers and in enrolments even though the Roman Catholic Church has continued to hold the position enunciated in The Catholic World for February, 1869 that "the Catholics of this country . . . cannot avail themselves of the public school system." Great numbers of Roman Catholics have not, however, abided by the official position of their church, and today eighty-seven per cent of the 33,468,000 children and youths enrolled in school attend publicly supported institutions.

This secularization of the predominant control of education below the college level must be accounted, I think, the most crucial development in both elementary and secondary education during the 1874-1921 period. Three other changes have also been vital in transforming the nature of secondary education: first, the appearance of the junior high school, second, the subjugation of the college preparatory function, and third, the establishment of accrediting

agencies. Each helped prepare the way for the coming of the junior college, and so I discuss them briefly.

President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard initiated the course of events which led to the organization of junior high schools. In 1888 he delivered an address at the meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association entitled "Can School Programmes Be Shortened and Enriched?" Few educational addresses have had such strong reverberations. It stirred up discussion all across the country and led to the appointment in 1892 of the Committee of Ten under Eliot's chairmanship. That committee did not propose or even discuss the junior high school, but its findings prepared the ground which would immediately be tilled by increasing numbers of educators. Today the resulting 6-3-3- plan of structuring the schools has more adherents than any other.

The Report of the Committee of Ten did, however, discuss the much debated question of whether secondary schools should be -- to use the old term -- finishing schools or fitting schools, that is, "people's colleges" or college-preparatory institutions. It came out unanimously for the concept that they could and should be both:

> The secondary schools of the United States, taken as a whole, do not exist for the purpose of preparing boys and girls for college. Only an insignificant percentage of the graduates of these schools go to colleges or scientific schools . . . . The preparation of a few pupils for college or scientific school should in the ordinary secondary school be the incidental, and not the principal object. . . . The committee are of the opinion that the satisfactory completion of any one of the proposed programmes should admit to corresponding courses in colleges and scientific schools. They believe that this close articulation between the secondary schools and the higher institutions would be advantageous alike for the schools, the colleges, and the country.

So read the Report, but the double function it proposed of preparing students for college and preparing non-college-going students for life <u>in the same courses</u>

did not prove workable, and hence the third development under consideration became inevitable, namely, accreditation agencies.

Eliot appears to have been responsible for their initiation too. In December, 1879 he organized a conference of New England colleges which at its first meeting sponsored the initial regional effort to bring about the closer articulation between secondary schools and colleges. The conferees limited themselves to the single subject of English, but they soon expanded their interests. By 1884-85 a number of other subjects had been added, and representatives of secondary schools joined the conference to found the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools. Similar bodies immediately thereafter came into existence in other parts of the country: The Middle States Association in 1887, the North Central Association in 1892, and the Southern Association in 1895. Their activities led to the fabrication by 1909 of what came to be known as the Carnegie Unit, the device by means of which the college preparatory function of the secondary schools would be prevented from being swallowed up by the preparation-for-life function.

The accrediting agencies rapidly became powerful bodies. Their activities especially in the South and the Middle West prepared the way for the conversion of large numbers of weak four-year colleges and of displaced "finishing schools" into junior colleges. That story, however, can best be told later. I therefore turn to a brief survey of the changes concurrently being made in the liberal arts colleges.

The Liberal Arts Colleges

During the first twenty years or so of the 1874-1921 period these colleges were generally called "academical colleges" or, if units of universities, "academical departments." These names distinguished them from the new

and fast-growing colleges of agriculture and engineering. The proponents of liberal arts or "academical" colleges as they were then called proudly proclaimed their devotion to liberal education by which they meant literary education; and they bitterly resisted the efforts of reformers to give the sciences, the modern languages, and the social sciences equal status with the classics of the ancient world. The great majority of their trustees, administrators, and faculty members believed, as President Josiah Quincy of Harvard expressed it in 1840, that "the safe ways are the trodden paths" and that the classical curriculum should not be disturbed because it had been forged in the minds of "giants of former times" and hence stood before the world "chiselled upon works little less admirable than those of nature herself, and imperishable as her mountains."

Statements such as these impressed a diminishing number of Americans. Thus in 1843 Noah Webster wrote that the colleges, once highly regarded, had come to be considered "nurseries of Inequality, the Enemies of Liberty." Meanwhile President Francis Wayland of Brown had written his Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System wherein he eloquently argued that "the present system of collegiate education does not meet the wants of the public." It must, he insisted, be completely redesigned to serve not only "the professional classes" but also the practical men who were transforming the country from an agrarian to a technological society. During "the present century," he wrote, "a new order" has "dawned upon the world"; and the colleges must be equal to it or be discarded.

Efforts to discard the liberal arts college continued well into the twentieth century, but a series of events occurred just before and early during the 1874-1921 period which not only saved it from destruction but, more than that, made it all but indestructible. Many enemies, including some prominent graduates, attacked it; but they failed to guage the strength it acquired by inter-

blending the best of its old characteristics with those created by the events occurring during the last third of the nineteenth century.

The old characteristics were zealous devotion, first, to the preservation and enrichment of the intellectual and spiritual heritage of Western man, second, to the conviction that education for breadth of knowledge should be as carefully nurtured as education for specialized depth, and third, to the belief that religious bodies and groups of private citizens should have the unquestioned right to engage in higher education.

Most of the "New Educators," as many of the reformers called themselves, saw the insistent and increasing need of practical or utilitarian education; and because the academical colleges interpreted heritage and breadth in terms of the ancient rather than of the modern world, the New Educators brushed aside their claims as meaningless if not worthless. As for the right of churches and private citizens to engage in higher education, the most ardent of the New Educators believed it desirable that all education from kindergarten to university should be taken over by the state. They therefore initiated legislation in a number of states to vitiate the ruling in the Dartmouth College Case on which private enterprise in higher education rested.

Not until well into the twentieth century would the academical colleges move to modernize their conceptions of heritage and breadth, but meanwhile the privately controlled universities as a group made more and longer forward strides than did the state universities as a group. The 1955 roster of the American Association of Universities witnesses the fact: only fifteen of its thirty-seven members are state universities. In short, the much and justly criticized academical colleges successfully met the attacks upon them. They did this by means of a series of actions now to be described.

To begin with the colleges added what they called "parallel courses" in the scientific and engineering subjects, a plan initiated at Union College as early as 1828 and slowly copied by other colleges. These took two chief forms, one predominant in the East, the other in the Middle West. The eastern colleges tended to keep the old academical college intact and to organize new structures for the newer subjects. Thus in 1846 Harvard established the Lawrence Scientific School, and the same year Yale initiated what later became the Sheffield Scientific School. Many other eastern colleges followed their leadership. In the Middle West, on the other hand, the colleges generally maintained a single structure; but within it they organized three curriculums -- one focused on the classical languages and leading to the A.B. degree, a second emphasizing the modern languages and conferring the Ph.B. degree, and a third stressing the sciences and terminating with the B.S. degree. The University of Chicago, for example, opened in 1892 with these three programs.

These curricular renovations gave expression to the principle that students should have a measure of freedom in choosing their studies. Jefferson had first applied this, the elective principle, at William and Mary College and then at the University of Virginia; and during the last quarter of the nineteenth century it overspread the country under the dominating personality of President Eliot of Harvard. The Eliot so-called "free-elective system," took hold only at Harvard; but other expressions of the elective principle pushed aside everything that stood in their way. They opened up curriculums to the new subjects which clearly had to be admitted, and they led to the gradual but complete breaking of the monopoly of the classical languages.

The liberal arts colleges took another action which also protected their continuity, namely, the introduction of undergraduate specialization. This development has had such large consequences that I discuss it at length later and hence now turn to the extracurricular considerations that would vitally

contribute to the stability and staying power of the traditional colleges.

Since their earliest days the colleges had permitted students to engage mildly in extracurricular activities. During the period under review, however, these multiplied fantastically. Associated with the adoption of coeducation and the organization of residential fraternities, they completely changed the face of American higher education. The change had unanticipated results, the most important of which was this: it tightened the hold of the colleges upon the affections of the American people. The hold became, in fact, much too firm for the educational reformers -- no matter how logical their arguments -- to force the four-year colleges out of existence.

The logical arguments of the reformers in their campaign to kill off the college included, first, the demonstration that the freshman and sophomore years duplicated work done in high school, a demonstration which led to the conclusion that these years should be pushed back into the secondary schools; second, the thesis that the secondary schools should be responsible for general education, the transition from one to the other coming at the point of change-over to career-oriented education; third, the clear fact that the addition of the freshman and sophomoreyears to local secondary schools would save the families of college-going youths many hundreds of dollars; and fourth, the affirmation that the proposed structural reorganization would conspicuously reduce the appalling number of flunk-outs of the traditional freshman and sophomore years.

These and their associated arguments convinced many educators, but the general public paid less attention to them than anticipated. Going to college to most Americans has always meant leaving home and participating in the thrills of college life. It has meant breaking the psychological umbilical

cord which tied youths to their parents, being on one's own, learning to be self-sufficient, matching one's wits with one's contemporaries without being constantly afflicted by the advice of dull-witted parents. It has also meant that the preponderance of Americans have judged the informal education of college life no less important than the formal education of the college courses. For these values they have been willing to sacrifice the dollars that could be saved by patronizing local junior colleges.

The fact that the American people look upon the American college and upon the undergraduate years of the American university as almost magical centers of social education and hence as agencies of upward social mobility has annoyed many educators. They have insisted that higher education should be entirely devoted to intellectual pursuits and interests, and they have done their best to make it such. The American people, however, have rejected this doctrine. Their continued patronage of the traditional college witnesses their desire for the products of both the curriculum and the extracurriculum in institutions outside the immediate range of family surveillance. True, junior college attendance has increased phenomenally, but a study of the sentiments of those who attend them would almost certainly adduce evidence that, for the great majority, junior colleges are second-best choices. More on this point later.

To summarize: during the 1874-1921 period the liberal arts college won back the waning confidence of the American people, first, by means of comprehensive educational changes and second, by coming to be recognized as the nation's most powerful agencies of upward social mobility.

The Professional Schools

Until late in the nineteenth century most American lawyers, ministers, and physicians got their training by means of the apprenticeship system. Intending

lawyers predominantly read law in offices of practising attornies; those who desired to become preachers served generally as assistants to established clergymen; and would-be physicians by and large learned their craft by doing the chores of their licensed mentors. Perhaps the most spectacular and also most important change in American higher education between 1874 and 1921 occurred in professional education. During this period the great majority of those who entered these ancient professions would come to be trained in professional schools, and those schools would become associated with universities.

The first American university-associated professional schools were instituted late in the eighteenth century, all four of them devoted to medical education. Pennsylvania organized the first in 1767; and Columbia, Harvard, and Dartmouth soon followed suit. Though they bore the names of the colleges to which they were attached, they operated independently as did also the soon-to-appear college-connected schools of law and divinity. Most of the professional schools had no college affiliations, and the majority of their managers operated them for financial gain. Further, all but a few of those who attended either of these two types of professional schools entered without ever having attended college; and an appreciable percentage of them were semi-literate. When in 1870, for example, President Eliot proposed that written examinations be substituted for the traditional oral examinations at the Harvard Medical School, the dean responded: "Written examinations are impossible in the Medical School. A majority of the students cannot write well enough."

Nor did the professional schools -- not even those connected with the colleges -- give anything comparable to what today would be considered acceptable training. To use medicine again as an illustration, the course consisted of three months of lectures repeated three years in succession -- the same lectures. During nine months of each year medical students served

as apprentices, and during the other three they listened to the lectures which most professors had preserved without change from their original writing many years before.

At the end of the third year came the oral examinations. Henry James has reported the experience of his father, William James, when he took them at Harvard in November, 1868:

> In a large room a number of professors sufficient to examine in the nine principal subjects disposed themselves at suitable intervals. The students were circulated singly from one to the next and were quizzed on a new subject at each station of the journey. Every ten minutes a presiding functionary sounded a bell and the candidate moved along. When the bell had pealed nine times. . . the examiners were expected to be ready to vote. This they did without consultation. . . . Each had a piece of cardboard that was white on one side and marked with a black spot on the other. The Dean called the name of a candidate and pronounced a formal question and command--"Are you ready to vote?--Vote!" The nine examiners simultaneously thrust forward their cards. If the Dean counted not more than four black spots, the candidate received his degree. When the candidate had thus captured his degree, he could hang out his sign and work his ignorance at will on the patients who came to him, for under the laws as they then were a School diploma conferred the right to practice.

The great university presidents of the succeeding period -- Eliot at Harvard and Gilman at California and Johns Hopkins taking the leadership -- set about the business of changing this deplorable situation not only in medicine but also in law and divinity and in the newer professions then emerging. Toward this end they took three courses of action. First, they reached out and brought the better professional schools into administrative association with universities; second, they required high school graduation and then increasing amounts of college work for admission to the professional schools under their control; and third, they extended the length and improved the quality of professional courses. Immediately upon taking office as President of Harvard in 1869, for example, Eliot successfully moved to require high school graduation for admission to the Harvard Medical School, and by 1902 the requirement had increased to a bachelor's degree.

Meanwhile the training period had lengthened from nine to twenty-seven months, stiff laboratory courses had been instituted, the diploma privilege had given way to written examinations administered by state boards of medical examiners, and an internship of at least a year had been added. Comparable improvements occurred in law and divinity; and although almost none of the newer professional schools would venture to demand the bachelor's degree for admission, they very substantially increased the number of years of education they required for entrance and also greatly stiffened up the quality of their training.

Today all the newer professional schools (about 200 teacher training institutions excepted) are university-connected. They range from those serving the several branches of agriculture to those training social workers. Originally all operated as unitary structures, but the Land Grant College Act of 1862 set in motion the forces that would bring them within the orbit of universities. Had they remained unitary, the United States would have continued to follow the European method of providing education for those not destined for the historic learned professions.

As I see it, the Land Grant College Act has had more influence upon the structuring and therefore upon the essential nature of American higher education than any other event since its inception in 1636. Unfortunately I can say no more about it here than this: American equalitarians bitterly resented what they considered the snobbishness of the academical colleges, and hence they promoted the Land Grant College Act and then interpreted its provisions in ways that would guarantee the development of the American comprehensive university. I describe this uniquely American institution in the next chapter, and I conclude this present one by observing that during the 1874-1921 period the evolving American university extended its area of service by accepting responsibility for

the training of the members of the newer professions. It largely rejected, however, any concern for training those planning to enter what have recently come to be called the semiprofessions. Other institutions would arise to minister to them, and chief among these would be junior colleges.

CHAPTER THREE

THE THREE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY PLANS

> Universities easily fall into ruts. Almost every epoch requires a fresh start.
>
> Daniel Coit Gilman, 1876.

As observed early in the last chapter, little would be said there or here about junior colleges. The over-all scheme of American educational organization needs first to be diagramed. The effort toward that end continues in this present chapter.

The research that my students and I have thus far completed has identified three structural patterns that have striven for supremacy in American higher education. They are (1) the unitary plan, (2) the bifurcated university plan, and (3) the comprehensive university plan. I shall describe each in turn, but first some observations must be made about what a century ago went by the name of "the University Idea." The junior college of today is a by-product of the University Idea as it got expressed in the effort to kill off the historic four-year college by bifurcating it disjunctively, that is, by assigning its freshman and sophomore years to secondary schools and its junior and senior years to reorganized universities.

"The University Idea"

The name "university" first came actively into American thinking and planning during the Revolution. Nine colleges had been established before the break with England, but no one thought of them as universities. Some of their leaders visualized their becoming such, but plans to organize American universities first took form in the constitutions of the States of Pennsylvania and North Carolina, both adopted in 1776 and both providing for universities. The next year Ezra

Stiles, President of Yale College, wrote and published a memorandum for the Assembly of the State of Connecticut entitled "Plan of a University," and in 1779 the "academy and college" which Benjamin Franklin had organized in Philadelphia assumed the name of the University of the State of Pennsylvania. Harvard's legal name to this day continues to be "The President and Fellows of Harvard College," but it has been called Harvard University since the 1780 constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts referred to it as "the University at Cambridge."

The growing use of the name university expressed hopes rather than accomplishments. No university comparable to those of Europe appeared in the United States until exactly a century after the signing of the Declaration of Independence when Johns Hopkins University opened. "The day of the university has dawned," its brilliant president, Daniel Coit Gilman, had declared four years earlier; and with the establishment of "The Hopkins" dawn it did.

Long decades of animated demands and persistent efforts by leading educators and laymen had been required to prepare the way. Jefferson had founded the University of Virginia; but he died in 1826, sixteen months after its opening. Not until the twentieth century would it begin to approach his dreams for it. Meanwhile at a "convention of literary and scientific gentlemen" held in New York city in 1830, George Bancroft, Harvard alumnus and a Ph.D. of the University of Göttingen, had popularized the slogan "The University Idea"; and at the same convention, Henry Dwight, son of the late eminent president of Yale, Timothy Dwight the Elder, exclaimed: "We need a University like those of Germany."

Meanwhile Professor George Ticknor of Harvard had likened "the University at Cambridge" to a high school, a sentiment to be repeated even more

forcibly in 1866 when a distinguished Harvard professor declared his alma mater to be nothing more than a school for boys in a nation which urgently needed universities. Three years later Charles W. Eliot became president of Harvard and began his extraordinarily successful efforts to convert it from a small backward-looking college into a great forward-looking university. The previous year Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, had asserted that "America has no universities." No one took issue with him since he did no more than paraphrase statements that Americans had been making for decades.

The launching of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 opened the flood-gates behind which power for change had long been gathering, and universities sprang up all over the nation. Some of them exfoliated from long established colleges as at Columbia, Harvard, and Yale. Some arose in the institutions founded with funds raised from the land grants of the Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 -- for example, Indiana, Iowa, and Michigan. Some germinated from the Morrill Act of 1862 as did California, Ohio State, and Wisconsin. A few -- Chicago, Clark, and Stanford in particular -- came forth full-fledged from the drawing boards of university designers. When in 1900 the presidents of five of these institutions projected the American Association of Universities, they invited their colleagues at nine other universities to join them. The fourteen members of the Association in 1900 have now increased to thirty-seven, but the United States Office of Education judges almost four times that number (131) to be universities. Even the lower figure testifies to the remarkable fecundity during the past 80 years of "the University Idea."

Chiefly because of the existence of both public and private universities and of the principle of local control for both varieties of institutions, American universities differ markedly. As self-governing enterprises, they are primarily the products of the historical decisions of their founders and of

the policy makers who have followed them. Many decisions have entered into their shaping, but those relating to one issue above all others has been crucial, namely, the answers given to the question of how each university should relate itself to the historic four-year colleges.

I proceed immediatly to enlarge upon this thesis, but first may I observe that I can find no other explanation of the thriving condition of junior colleges in some parts of the country and their laggard state in others. Where the leading universities of an area have been solicitous, in the words of Charles W. Eliot, "to save the college" junior colleges have not prospered. Where, on the other hand, the leading universities of a region have urged, in the words of Dean Alexis F. Lange of the University of California, "the amputation of Freshman and Sophomore classes," junior colleges have boomed.

In any case, every American University has had to decide which of the three structural arrangements listed several pages back it would follow. They were, it will be recalled, (1) the unitary university plan, (2) the bifurcated university plan, and (3) the comprehensive university plan. I describe each in turn and in the process show that the comprehensive plan has worsted the other two. Its rise to dominance, I shall show in Chapter Four, led to the appearance of junior colleges.

The Unitary University

By a unitary university I mean one which stands alone, which has no undergraduate college attached to it. Since the sixteenth century in Germany and since the Revolution in France, the historic undergraduate function of general as distinguished from specialized education has been performed by the secondary schools of both countries. French and German universities are therefore unitary structures. Both have been used as models in attempts to divert American higher education from its British antecedents.

The French model led to one variety of American unitary university, the German to another. I describe, first, Jefferson's effort to follow the French plan at the University of Virgina and, second, the three attempts later in the nineteenth century to establish unitary universities comparable to those in Germany. All failed, and their failure led other educators to project the bificurated university. Of that in due course. First the unitary university efforts must be reviewed.

Jefferson's long interest in education began in 1776 when he became a member of the Committee of the Virginia Legislature to reorganize William and Mary, his alma mater. Then in 1779, as Governor, he presented to the Legislature his "A Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge" which proposed a three level educational structuring: primary schools, secondary, (grammar -- sic!) schools, and colleges. After spending five years in France as American minister he revised his ideas about the structuring of education; and when he came to plan the University of Virginia, he proposed elementary schools, colleges, and a state university. He made no provision for the burgeoning academies which within a few decades would be paralleled by high schools. Nor did his French friend and associate Pierre Samuel Du Pont who, at Jefferson's request, wrote in 1800 his National Education in the United States of America.

The rapid development of secondary education made the Jefferson-Du Pont arrangement inapplicable in the United States, but the point in need of emphasis here is that both men conceived of the third or university level as entirely devoted to specialized education. General education should, they believed, be concluded on the secondary level. At the University of Virginia Jefferson therefore organized eight specialized schools: ancient languages, modern languages, mathematics, natural philosophy. moral philosophy, chemistry, medicine, and law.* A student assumed responsibility for the studies of only one school.

*See Appendix One.

He could if he wished attend the lectures of other schools, but the university authorities did not require or even expect such extra work.

In short, the University of Virginia opened as a unitary university. For a variety of reasons it did not so continue. Indeed, instead of turning American education away from the British to the French structural plan, it gradually moved over to the dominant English tradition of non-specialized undergraduate instruction.

Half a century after the opening of the University of Virginia Daniel Coit Gilman made a second attempt to establish a unitary university in the United States. He looked to Germany rather than to France for his inspiration. Then in 1889 Clark University and Catholic University followed his leadership. I shall describe each of the three enterprises, but first the difference between the Jefferson and Gilman structural plans must be clarified.

Jefferson proposed a three-level structuring of education -- school, college, university. Meanwhile, however, the high school had begun to sprout. By Gilman's time, therefore, three pre-university levels existed in considerable strength, and he had too much wisdom to prejudice his plans by attacking any of them, least of all the college. Hence he planned a post-college university, proposing only -- and mildly -- that the undergraduate course be reduced from four to three years. In other words, he did not join the growing number of educators who attacked the historic college. Instead, he accepted the college and proposed that a fourth level be added, which would be a replica of the Philosophische Fakultät of the German university.* Further, he wanted his fourth or university level to be unitary, that is, to have no undergraduate college connected with it.

*See Appendix One

His plans, however, never matured. Although sympathetic with his conception, the Johns Hopkins Board of Trustees felt that the people of Baltimore would not be favorably disposed toward the new institution unless it admitted at least a few local high school graduates. Reluctantly Gilman acquiesced, but he tried to keep the numbers of undergraduates small. That his successors have not succeeded in holding to his policy is evidenced by the fact that today approximately 70 per cent of Johns Hopkins students are working for baccalaureate degrees.

The Clark University and Catholic University enterprises had greater success. At least they got under steam -- both in the year 1889. Clark continued to be a unitary university until 1924; but its back-sliding founder, Jonas Gilman Clark, died in 1900 and required in his will that an undergraduate college be erected alongside it. When G. Stanley Hall retired from the presidency in 1924, of economic necessity the two institutions were joined. Meanwhile the Catholic University adventure had been dead for 20 years. The Roman Catholic hierarchy both in the United States and Rome disliked it; and Rome assigned its promoter and first Rector, Bishop John Joseph Keane, to a minor diocese in the Middle West. Since 1904 Catholic University has been a comprehensive institution.

A fifth unitary university project needs brief mention, namely, that in operation at the University of Buffalo from its founding in 1846 to the organization in 1913 of its College of Arts and Sciences. It opened as a medical school; and during its 67 years before 1913 it added schools of pharmacy, law, and dentistry. To survive in the growing competition it also had to add an undergraduate unit after the First World War.

Perhaps unitary university adventures other than the five here reviewed have been propagated and had brief lives, but I've not yet learned of them.

Richard J. Storr in his 1953 book, The Beginnings of Graduate Education in America, catalogues a number of unitary universities projected during the middle decades of the nineteenth century, but none of them ever got beyond the memorandum stage. Their failure, along with that of the five cited here, confirms the generalization to which I've come, namely, that universities without undergraduate colleges cannot survive in the socio-economic atmosphere of the United States. The local control inherent in American pluralism and the need -- regardless of undergraduate fees -- of students for Ph.D. candidates to serve as instructors, paper readers, and laboratory assistants, seem to be working continuously and permanently against the unitary university idea. Moreover, alumni and the general public don't like it not only because it interferes with athletics and fraternities but chiefly because it appears to many of them -- and to Americans at large -- to smack of intellectual snobbishness. A statement from the 1954 doctoral dissertation of one of my students, Mrs. Lois Mayfield Wilson, describes this sentiment:

> An egalitarian society such as that of the United States has as a basic tenet the belief that no limits should be established to the areas in which top-level institutions may operate. This belief leads to a considerable opposition to objective structural discriptions and practices because they tend to set bounds and to assign roles. Egalitarians believe that the elaboration of roles in formal statements implies superiority and inferiority and, worse, leads to the hardening of differentiations among individuals and groups and hence to a stratified society.

Almost all the promoters of the junior college have declared themselves to be crusaders par excellence for "the democratization of American education," and thus Mrs. Wilson's statement will probably be abhorrent to them. Her position and theirs will be examined later. Meanwhile I turn to the second program for the structuring of higher education, namely, the bifurcated university plan. It spawned the junior college.

The Bifurcated University

By a bifurcated university I mean one which has turned over the freshman and sophomore years to the secondary schools and which therefore starts its work at the beginning of the historic junior year. None exist today, but a number of leading universities have tried mightily to convert themselves into such structures. The first effort got under way in 1852; the last failed in 1953. During the intervening century the junior college emerged as a by-product of these campaigns to reorganize American education.

The promoters of the bifurcated university all wanted to establish unitary universities, that is, structures with no undergraduate colleges attached to them. They had to contend, however, with two facts which had relatively little potency in Jefferson's day but which had been foremost in the thinking of Gilman, Hall, and Keane. These men saw clearly that the college in particular had become a much-beloved American institution and that those who tampered with it courted defeat for their plans. They therefore did not attack it. The proponents of the bifurcated university, on the other hand, had little respect for the college and tried to kill it off. For example, one of the most ardent advocates of this type of university asked in 1917: "Shall certain colleges have their heads cut off, and if so, by whom? Shall the American university-college have its legs cut off, and if so, where?" Dean Alexis F. Lange, of the University, the propounder of these questions, well knew the answers he had already done much to force into operational fact. In the next chapter I shall detail Dean Lange's activities, but his antecedents must first be identified.

President John T. Kirkland of Harvard gave brief thought to the bifurcation plan in 1816, but he rejected it. "If we throw back our elements, such as are taught the first two years . . . upon the Schools," he wrote, "we shall lose our pupils or at least have them but two years instead of four." Fifty-six years later President Eliot toyed with the same notion, but he too rejected it.

Meanwhile, however, Chancellor Henry P. Tappan of the University of Michigan had espoused it earnestly, indeed, passionately; and, though Tappan failed, President William W. Folwell of the University of Minnesota followed his leading to the same result. Tappan and Folwell have so frequently been claimed as progenitors of the junior college movement that their misadventures must be summarized.

On December 21, 1852, Tappan delivered his inaugural address as the first executive head of the University of Michigan. He had been on the faculty of the institution which grew into New York University, and he had been one of the leaders of the movement to further the University Idea by establishing a new university in New York City. He had also gone abroad to study the educational systems of England, France, and Germany. He had written a widely read book in 1851 entitled University Education wherein he lauded the German program. He devoted his inaugural address, therefore, to enlarging upon the theme of his book which he had stated succinctly in these three sentences:

> We have spoken of the excellence of the German universities as model institutions. Their excellence consists in two things: first, they are purely Universities, without any admixture of collegial instruction. Secondly, they are complete Universities providing [instruction in all higher subjects].

Tappan well knew that the original Catholepistemiad or University of Michigania had been projected in 1817 in a territory that had but recently been acquired from France. He also knew, however, that it had never been organized but that, instead, the designers of the institution whose headship he now assumed had been enamored of the Prussian system. He therefore expected widespread support of his plan to convert into fact a statement that he wrote for the first University of Michigan catalogue produced during his administration. It read: "The State of Michigan has copied from Prussia what is acknowledged to be the most perfect educational system in the world."

This "most perfect system" sets up three educational levels: the primary, covering eight years; the intermediate five or six years; and the university "which

has no limited term, but affords scope for unlimited progress in knowledge." In brief, Tappan proposed a unitary university as had Jefferson, but he thought the German model superior to the French. Further, he ignored the power of the incubating high schools, and he directly attacked the four-year colleges of Michigan.

Although a Congregational minister, Tappan protested against the very existence of denominational colleges; and when they continued to thrive regardless, he proposed that they demote themselves to secondary schools:

> Let the denominational colleges of this State exert themselves and increase their efficiency by becoming proper gymnasia, and let the State aid those already in existence. But then let measures be taken to establish the State gymnasia. Why should the Disciplinary course be left to be imperfectly and irregularly supplied by denominational efforts?

The denominational colleges of Michigan did not submit meekly to Tappan's attacks. On the contrary, they fought back briskly if not brutally and unquestionably had much to do with creating the situation that led to Tappan's dismissal by the Board of Regents in 1863. Thus ended the first campaign to create a bifurcated university.

The second campaign got under way six years later at the University of Minnesota. Its sponsor, President William W. Folwell, proposed it in his 1869 inaugural address and soon called it "The Minnesota Plan." Describing the plan at the 1875 meeting of the National Education Association, he declared: "The work of the first two years of the college is work of the secondary school, and there it can be done most efficiently and economically. Turn this work over to the high school." The people of Minnesota, however, liked Folwell's policy no better than the people of Michigan liked Tappan's; and so Folwell resigned in 1884. Commenting in 1909 about his scheme, he wrote:

> This proposal to dethrone the traditional system of higher education seemed to orthodox friends who really understood it as the rant of a wild educational mutineer. That it was not openly and vigorously denounced, was due to the fact that it was not understood, or, if understood, was not taken seriously.

The scene shifts to Chicago in the early nineties. In May, 1889, John D. Rockefeller had pledged $600,000 for the building of a new Baptist university on the ashes of the bankrupt University of Chicago which Stephen Douglas had helped initiate in 1859. Rockefeller and his Baptist associates in the reorganization agreed unanimously that the new University of Chicago should be headed by William Rainey Harper, at the time 32 years of age and Professor of Semitic Languages at Yale. Harper had graduated from Muskingum College before he had reached fourteen years of age, had taken his Ph.D. at Yale before turning nineteen, and had been intimately involved in the Chicago venture from the beginning. For example, he had done yeoman service in helping raise the additional $400,000 needed to confirm Rockefeller's gift. After his election to the presidency in September, 1890, however, Harper took five months to decide whether or not he'd accept.

Rockefeller, Gates, Goodspeed, and apparently all the other members of the new University of Chicago Board of Trustees wanted a college; but Harper wanted a university and only a university. As he conceived it, the new institution should not be concerned with undergraduate instruction but, instead, should be what he called "a great research university" devoted entirely to graduate and professional teaching and investigation. Negotiations proceeded for five months and ended in a compromise: the new institution would be a combined college and university. Harper, however, made it clear that he intended to move as rapidly as possible to slough off the freshman and sophomore years, and he proceeded immediatly to make plans toward that end. Among other things he divided the four undergraduate years down the middle, calling the freshman and sophomore years "the academical college" and the junior and senior years "the university college." Then in 1896 he changed these designations to "junior college" and "senior college." In sum, he set the stage for Chicago to cease being a comprehensive university and to become a bifurcated university.

Being as he has been called "a dynamo in pants," Harper did not stop with setting the stage. He immediately put his Herculean energies to work toward the end of dropping the freshman and sophomore years even before the University of Chicago opened in October, 1892: in one of the "Official Bulletins" which announced to the public how the new university would operate he outlined the most ambitious, most dazzling plan of educational organization that any American has ever had the imagination to conceive. He called it "University Affiliations."

In the next chapter I shall explain the "University Affiliations" conception and its relationship to the junior college movement. Enough for present purposes to observe that even before Harper died in 1906 at the untimely age of 49, his plan had run into serious trouble. Then in 1913 the Chicago Board of Trustees finally discarded the affiliation formula, but Harper's dream of sloughing off the freshman and sophomore years lived on in the minds of many of his associates. When in 1929 Robert Maynard Hutchins became president, he found that advocates of the bifurcated university held a number -- perhaps the majority -- of the major administrative posts in the institution. Soon he joined them in attempting to convert Harper's bifurcation dream into reality. I tell that story in the next chapter along with stories of similar efforts in Texas, California, and Missouri. All failed, but all led to the organization of unitary junior colleges.

These bifurcation drives failed because of the preponderant acceptance of the comprehensive university idea with which I now deal.

The Comprehensive University

By a comprehensive university I mean an educational institution made up of a number of sub-structures including a four-year undergraduate college, a graduate school of arts and sciences, and one or more professional schools. Otherwise expressed, a comprehensive university includes within one educational organism units concerned with all higher educational functions.

The proponents of the unitary university plan tried to establish structures that lacked the historic undergraduate college. The reformers who attempted to convert existing universities into the bifurcation pattern sought to force the freshman and sophomore years down into the secondary schools. Both enterprises failed, the American people choosing to support the comprehensive university formula. On the remaining pages of this chapter I trace the circumstances that have led to this choice.

On Ralph Waldo Emerson's 66th birthday, May 25th, 1869, he served as "the youngest and least imposing member" of the committee of the Harvard Board of Overseers that informed 35-year-old Charles W. Eliot that he had been elected president of the nation's oldest college. Writing a few minutes before the fateful session to his friend and fellow chemist, Professor Samuel W. Johnson of the Yale Sheffield Scientific School, Eliot wrote in part:

> Query -- what <u>are</u> they going to say or do? Pat me on the head, doubtless, and say 'good boy'-- 'Vision and strength' -- that is well said -- that is just exactly what is needed. Take 'care of your stomach and reserve yourself for good days to come.'
>
> . . . The post-graduate teaching is, I believe, the first thing to come upon the carpet. A committee has been at work upon it all this term at Cambridge. Look out for a long season of debates and a laborious sifting of the wheat by slow degrees.

The last three words -- "by slow degrees" -- would be Eliot's motto throughout his forty-year administration. Yet no one doubted his strength. Oliver Wendell Holmes soon wrote to his fellow alumnus, John Lathrop Motley, for example, that Eliot acted "as if he had been born President" and had "turned Harvard over like a flap jack." Eliot never took an action, however, without first having prepared the ground carefully. Nor did he ever diverge from his conviction that the American university should be built "<u>on top of</u> the American college."

Those who abhorred the university idea, especially the German variety of it, would not, Eliot knew, tolerate any activity by him or by anyone else which would underprivilege Harvard College. These sentiments, moreover, would continue and

even grow in strength. James Russell Lowell expressed them 17 years later in the major address at the Harvard 250th anniversary ceremonies when he declared to ringing applause: "It is the birthday of the college that we are celebrating, it is the college that we love and of which we are proud."

Eliot, himself a Harvard alumnus and descendant of a long line of graduates reaching back to the Class of 1656, had no intention of harming Harvard College. He not only agreed with James Russell Lowell but, further, the blood of cautious Yankees coursed through his veins. What he would do, he would do slowly and always with the hallowed heritageof the College in the forefront of his mind. In his inaugural address, therefore, he observed that "sudden reconstruction is impossible in our high places of education" and that hence the protectors of the College had no cause to be alarmed about what he would do.

That he said this in complete sincerity his subsequent activities leave no trace of doubt. Beginning in 1882 he would strive unceasingly for the remaining 27 years of his administration to reduce the Harvard undergraduate course from four to three years; but he proposed the change, he pointed out again and again, to "save the college" from the university bifurcators and from its other enemies. His successor, A. Lawrence Lowell, however, demolished the Eliot three-year campaign by means of a single declaration in his inaugural address: "The most vital measure for saving the college is not to shorten its duration, but to ensure that it shall be worth saving."

Eliot, Lowell, the faculties, and the alumni of Harvard had no doubt that the college was worth saving; and the same sentiments governed the thinking of those shaping the destinies of the other eastern colleges which were concurrently remodeling themselves into universities -- Columbia, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Yale, and the lesser institutions which followed their leadership. Cornell? It had begun without a typical undergraduate college, but the climate of eastern opinion made the establishment of a college inevitable even though Cornell's first two presidents -- Andrew

Dickson White and Charles Kendall Adams -- had come out vigorously in support of bifurcation.

The state universities followed the example of the eastern institutions and also organized undergraduate colleges. Michigan, the largest and most influential of them during this period, had learned from the Tappan fiasco that bifurcation would not work; and although its great president, James Burrill Angell, several times expressed his personal preference for that formula, he never proposed its inauguration. Instead, he promoted another plan of action which would become standard practice for all the state universities and also for a number of private institutions, namely, the upper-lower division plan.

This plan constituted -- and constitutes because it is still in wide use -- a limited kind of bifurcation; I have been calling it internal bifurcation in my courses as distingusihed from the Harper program of disjunctive bifurcation. Disjunctive bifurcation disjoins the freshman and sophomore years from the university by allocating them to the secondary schools; internal bifurcation, on the other hand, keeps these years within the university but sets them apart in a so-called lower division. Apparently Henry P. Frieze first proposed this scheme in 1882 while acting as president of the University of Michigan during one of Angell's absences on a diplomatic mission for the United States Government. Angell saw in it a compromise arrangement and both approved and backed it. It did not prosper there or anywhere else, however, until after the turn of the century; and meanwhile two Michigan alumni who had studied under the plan would carry it to the University of California where they would employ it as the opening wedge in their carefully thought out effort to bifurcate that institution disjunctively. In the process of their efforts California junior colleges would be hatched and become more numerous, larger, and stronger than those of any other section of the nation.

I tell that story in the next chapter, but before beginning it the present chapter must be concluded with the observation that the comprehensive university today stands unchallenged. The unitary university plan never had a chance of success and has been forgotten by almost everyone. The bifurcation plan had ardent advocates and promoters for 101 years, but it seems probable that the sad experience that the University of Chicago had with it from 1942 to 1953 will warn away others from attempting it soon again.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE FOUR HISTORIC FOCI OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Wie est eigentlich war.

Leopold von Ranke*

Almost half of all regularly enrolled junior college students this year (1954), 44 per cent, attend California institutions. Texas has the second largest group -- nine per cent. Then comes Illinois and the six states bordering it, except Missouri, with eleven and one-half per cent. Missouri junior colleges enroll two and one-half per cent. Thus two of every three junior college students live and study in these four areas. From the beginning they have been the strongholds of the junior college movement. In this chapter I describe how this came about.

First, however, I state a generalization that I shall attempt to establish, namely, that in these four centers junior colleges are primarily the products of two forces: the bifurcated university campaign and the accreditation movement. I shall show that California and Middle Western junior colleges originally appeared upon the scene because of the bifurcation drive and that those in Texas and Missouri came into existence essentially because of the activities of accrediting agencies but with assists from convinced bifurcators.

I begin by reviewing the relationship of the University of Chicago to junior colleges from the time of Harper's promulgation of his plan of "University Affiliations" in 1891 to Chancellor Lawrence A. Kimpton's 1953 announcement of the

*Von Ranke, the most famous historian of the nineteenth century, championed disinterested historiography and insisted that source materials rather than legend and tradition be its basis. The epigraph here used was his slogan: Discover "how it really was."

abadonment of the 6-4-4 plan. I then proceed to report what had been happening concurrently in California, Texas, and Missouri.

The University of Chicago

A few pages back I called Harper's "University Affiliations" project "the most ambitious, most dazzling plan of educational organization that any American has ever had the imagination to conceive." Harper envisioned an educational empire not unlike the industrial empire already created by the principal benefactor of the University of Chicago, John D. Rockefeller. The operations of the Standard Oil Company extended from coast to coast, but Harper largely limited his ambitions to the "inland empire" of the Middle West. He dreamed of the University of Chicago as the axis about which would rotate an imposing number of secondary schools all of which would, he planned, add two more years of instruction and hence be six-year schools resembling the German gymnasien. The historic colleges, he hoped, would meanwhile drop their junior and senior years. Nor did he merely dream. He drafted a plan of action and set about bringing it to consummation.

The affiliated institutions, he wrote in Official Bulletin Number Two published in April, 1891, would be "situated at different points" geographically but would "in every case" function with "standards, curriculum and regulations" exactly like "those of the University of Chicago." This meant that the University of Chicago would organize the programs of these affiliated structures, write the examinations to be taken by their students, and generally treat them as branch institutions. They would, of course, drop their two upper years and hence become junior colleges. They would associate themselves, however, with secondary schools and thus be six year structures. At the end of their six-year programs they would confer the "title" of Associate in Arts; and those of their students who desired more advanced instruction would continue at the University of Chicago.

The affiliated schools fell into two groups -- those owned and operated by the University of Chicago and those owned and operated by their own boards of trustees but under the supervision of the University of Chicago. The former group never expanded beyond the single school originally included in the plan -- the Morgan Park Academy in one of the Chicago suburbs. The second group at the height of the enterprise numbered 10 schools -- five in Chicago, two in other Illinois communities, two in Indiana, and one in Wisconsin. Soon, however, Harper and his associates added a third group with a "looser relation . . . described and designated by the term of 'co-operation.'" Cooperation meant that the University of Chicago would accept the graduates of these schools without examination but would in turn expect to have some weight in determining their curriculums, teaching methods, and over-all procedures. In 1903 a total of 129 schools belonged to this third group. The great majority were located in twelve Middle Western states; but New York accounted for one, Pennsylvania and California for two each, and Colorado for three.

Harper also helped establish at least three new six-year affiliated secondary schools: Bradley Polytechnic Institute which opened early in 1897 at Peoria, Illinois with Harper holding the position of President of the Faculty; Lewis Institute in Chicago which opened the previous September with Harper on its board of trustees; and Joliet High School which in 1902 at Harper's suggestion added two additional years to its four-year curriculum. Bradley continued to operate under the Harper plan until 1920 when it organized a four-year undergraduate college, and in 1946 it changed its name to Bradley University. Lewis Institute began to change over to a four-year program in 1902 and completed the switch in 1918. Then in 1940 it joined with Armour Institute of Technology to become the Illinois Institute of Technology. Joliet High School, however, continues the Harper vision: it is a six-year high school, the last two years of which are designated the Joliet

Junior College. In 1953-54 it enrolled 389 freshmen and 97 sophomores who attended classes in the same building used by the high school students. Junior college historians celebrate it as the "first public junior college." A more accurate name would be "the first public junior college that has survived" since a number of others antedated it but soon vanished from view.

Harper's circle of intimates shared his enthusiasm for his affiliation scheme, but many of the members of the Chicago faculties disliked it enough to attack it. The small colleges meanwhile recognized it as a threat to their existence, and the maturing state universities of the "inland empire" looked upon it with growing suspicion. In 1896, therefore, Harper found it necessary to respond to the mounting number of attacks. He wrote:

> There has seemed to exist in some minds an idea that the practical working of affiliation will do away with the independence and strong development of the affiliated institution. It has also been suggested in the public press that affiliation with this or that institution was only a part of a general policy of the University to swallow up such institutions for the aggrandizement of the University. These expressions of apprehension proceed doubtless from entire ignorance of the facts and from failure to comprehend the principle underlying affiliation. There is only one point of view from which the attitude of the University can be interpreted as selfish, viz., the desire of the University that the students who come to it for higher work shall receive the best possible preparation. . . . In seeking to cooperate with colleges, high schools, and academies, the University confesses frankly its desire so to affect the work of these institutions as to secure more thoroughly prepared students for college and university work. . . . It may fairly be asked whether affiliation, or semi-affiliation or cooperation on the part of the University will in any way accomplish this result. In answer to this question one need only point to the history of the past, which shows that, at all events, so far as concerns educational work, important reforms proceed from the higher to the lower sphere of activity.

This explanation confirmed the fears of the critics. Harper wrote later that he took "the word 'affiliation' . . . from English educational terminology"; but the opponents of the plan believed, and not without reason, that he had embarked upon the business of making the University of Chicago the educational dictator of the Middle West with powers resembling those of the University of France and the

University of London. Against such centralization of power they vigorously objected, and hence they continued to oppose Harper's efforts.

Harper stayed on his course, however, and in 1903 he again delivered himself of a strong and lengthy defense of his objectives and activities. Therein he cited the "opposition to the policy [that] has arisen from the Faculties of the University and its students" and also that "of the colleges and their constituencies." Following his usual practise he itemized the arguments for and the arguments against his plan; he showed, he thought, that the favorable arguments greatly out-weighed the unfavorable ones. His statement had little effect. The situation worsened so perceptibly that in June 1913, seven and a half years after Harper's death, the University of Chicago Board of Trustees scrapped the affiliation plan completely.

Even had Harper lived, this denouement almost certainly could not have been prevented. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools had been gathering strength during all the years of Harper's campaign, and inevitably it assumed the articulation and accreditation functions that Harper had sought to attach to the University of Chicago. Thus died Harper's dream of empire.

But his plan to bifurcate the University of Chicago lived on sturdily in the minds of such Chicago leaders as President Harry Pratt Judson, Harper's successor, Dean Charles H. Judd, who became head of the School of Education in 1909, and Dean Gordon J. Laing who joined the Faculty in 1921. Before Robert Maynard Hutchins assumed office as fifth president in 1929, he had probably heard little if anything about junior colleges; but Judd, Laing, and their like-thinking associates soon won his enthusiasm for bifurcation. Thus during his 22 years in office he started championing it not only for the University of Chicago but also for the entire nation. By 1937 he had won enough converts to establish the 6-4-4 plan at the University of Chicago, and early in 1942 he announced that the University Senate and Board of

Trustees had approved his proposal that the Bachelor of Arts degree (but not the Bachelor of Science degree!) be awarded at the end of the new four-year college, that is, at the end of the historic sophomore year.

In his 1942 announcement of the Chicago break with tradition Hutchins predicted thatabout a dozen other universities would soon follow Chicago's leadership, but none did. Nor did any follow throughout the next 11 years during which time Lawrence A. Kimpton succeeded to Hutchins' post. This left Chicago in a precarious position, and rumors spread that it found it hard to attract enough students not only for its new-type college but also for its junior and senior years. In March, 1953 Kimpton confirmed these rumors by announcing, as Time reported him: "We've tried our innovation for eleven years, hoping that many other colleges and universities would join us. They haven't. There comes a point when you decide that perhaps everybody isn't our of step."

Two months later came a second announcement to the effect that, beginning in 1954, high school graduation normally be required for entrance to the undergraduate college of the University of Chicago. This meant, in effect, that the 6-4-4 plan had been abandoned. Explaining the reasons for the change to the alumni the following June, Kimpton said in part:

> Let us begin with the practical problems. The first of these developed quickly in the lack of enthusiasm, to say the least, upon the part of people in the field of secondary education. A program designed to cut their activity in two and to drain off their students at the junior and senior levels did not, understandably, enlist their support. Few students, therefore, entered at the first-year level of the College; and so marked was the antipathy of high-school teachers toward the program that they did not come to the University of Chicago to learn the content and techniques of general education so that the high-school programs could be upgraded in quality and material.
>
> The second problem that developed concerned our relationships with our sister-institutions of higher education. It was the expectation of Mr. Hutchins that many institutions of higher learning would shortly follow us in awarding the Bachelor of Arts degree at the end of the fourteenth grade or traditional Sophomore year in college. But none of them followed the pattern and example. The result was that if our graduate of

> the College transferred with his Bachelor's degree to another institution, he was admitted as a Junior . . . . A variation of this annoying problem occurred through the fact that a student who entered the College program after graduation from high school -- and most of them did -- was generally set back a year by the placement examinations so that he required three years to complete the College program. This meant that he had to spend five years to reach the traditional Bachelor's degree level and six years for the Master's degree. Thus a system that had acceleration as one of its original virtues began to operate in reverse.

So ended Chicago's 62-year flirtation with the bifurcated university plan. The University of Chicago has countless times been hailed as the original promoter of the junior college movement, but the probabilities seem low that it will soon again embark upon the 6-4-4 plan.

California

The University of Chicago bifurcation efforts have had little to do with the development of California junior colleges. Instead, two graduates of the University of Michigan brought the bifurcation idea from their alma mater, and they propagated it with the help of a graduate of Cornell. None of the three had had any immediate contact with the University of Chicago. In fact, all had finished both their undergraduate and graduate work before Chicago opened. The three men were Charles Mills Gayley, A.B. Michigan 1878; Alexis F. Lange, A.B. and A.M. 1885 and Ph.D. 1892, all from Michigan; and David Starr Jordan, a member of Cornell's first graduating class in 1878 and the recipient of the M.S. degree without a previous baccalaureate.

The junior college historians have of late years been hailing Lange as "the father of California junior colleges," but they have not as yet discovered Gayley. Of Jordan they have long been aware, but the story of his junior college gyrations has not as yet been told. I can do little more than allude to them here.

Gayley, born in Shanghai and educated in England and Northern Ireland, soon after his 1878 graduation from the University of Michigan, began his career teaching Latin there. He continued on the Michigan faculty until 1889 but meanwhile had

changed from Latin to English. Among his intimates were the members of the family of President James Burrill Angell, and among his enthusiasms was the internal bifurcation or upper-lower division plan that had been instituted in 1883 with President Angell's blessing. As I've already remarked, Angell would have preferred to follow the disjunctive bifurcation formula for which Tappan had striven; but that being an impossible program for Michigan, he settled for internal bifurcation.

When Gayley moved to Berkeley in 1889, however, he apparently decided that what could not be achieved in Ann Arbor might be accomplished on the west coast. As one of about a dozen full professors on the University of California faculty and, to boot, as one of the most charming and persuasive of the group, in 1892 he became head of a faculty committee on the reorganization of the program of the University. His committee unanimously proposed the internal bifurcation plan under which he had worked at Michigan.

At this point Lange came upon the scene, and from then on he had the major speaking part. That Gayley stood in the wings as prompter and even perhaps as author of some of his lines can, however, hardly be doubted. Gayley had brought Lange from Michigan to Berkeley a year after his own arrival. They had been senior and junior in Ann Arbor and would long be such in Berkeley, Gayley being Lange's departmental superior and, further, one of the most politically potent members of the California faculty. I feel certain that a careful exploration of the Berkeley archives will justify this belief, but in any case Lange moved out to front and center of the stage whenever the question of the structural reorganization of California education came up for discussion. Always Gayley supported him.

Lange continued in the English Department until 1907 when his interest in educational matters led President Benjamin Ide Wheeler to proposed that he transfer to the professorship of education which had just been vacated by Elmer E. Brown who had become United States Commissioner of Education. Six years later Lange took

over the headship of the newly organized School of Education, and he remained in that position until his death in 1924. During the intervening years he devoted large blocks of his time to promoting California junior colleges.

Among other things he got George E. Crothers, leading lawyer and Stanford trustee, to write the first bill relating to California junior colleges. Lange then persuaded Senator Anthony Caminetti to introduce it at Sacramento and to carry it through to passage. It authorized California high schools to add two years of work beyond the standard four-year course. It passed in 1907 and went into effect immediately although the City of Fresno, the first community to take advantage of its provisions, did not add the two additional years until 1910.

Several years ago I asked Judge Crothers about his work on the Caminetti bill and also the circumstances of his traveling with Lange in 1909 to Ithaca, New York to attend the tenth annual meeting of the Association of American Universities. Unfortunately he had entirely forgotten both experiences. Perhaps upon his death his papers will become available for perusal. They might help to illuminate the early junior college activities of David Starr Jordan, the third member of the triumvirate under present review.

As early as 1887 Jordan had written that "the college as a separate factor in our educational system may in time disappear," and in 1903 he predicted its disappearance "in fact." During all these and several following years, however, he wrote equally strong statements about the glory and durability of the four-year college. In 1907, the year of the passage of the Caminetti bill, he finally stabilized his point of view and came out pointedly in favor of bifurcation: he recommended to the Stanford Board of Trustees that it approve the dropping of the freshman and sophomore years. He repeated the proposal a year later. Crothers, a member of the board until 1912, undoubtedly supported these moves; but both attempts failed to muster enough votes.

In 1915 Jordan moved up to the innocuous position of chancellor and ceased being active in the administration of Stanford, but meanwhile he became an ardent propagandizer for junior colleges. Writing in 1916, Lange lauded his powerful influence in preparing for the legislation to expand the provisions of the Caminetti bill:

> By 1908 the high school teachers of the state had become generally aware of the fact that what was to be known as the junior college idea had been essentially put into practice at Berkeley and several of them were trying to utilize locally the precept and example of the State University.
>
> But this propaganda would probably not have gathered momentum very fast without President Jordan's dynamic articles and addresses urging the amputation of freshman and sophomore classes to prevent atrophy and urging the relegation of these classes to the high school. His advocacy of its upward extension made the public 'sit up and take notice' and thought and prodded schoolmen into taking the initiative.
>
> What had been a Berkeley idea at the beginning had become a California idea, and the spectable of Berkeley and Stanford climbing the Golden Stairs together, hand in hand, made its appeal with great persuasiveness. Moreover, while Berkeleyans had been in the habit of speaking of six-year high schools, Dr. Jordan gave general currency to the name junior college, and this proved much more potent in suggestible communities.

With Berkeley and Stanford leaders cooperating so enthusiastically, California soon became in very fact the Golden Stairs of the junior college movement: the earliest published statistical tables showed California leading in both number of institutions and in student enrollments,and its hegemony has never been challenged.

Texas

I shan't know as much about the beginnings of the junior college movement in Texas until I've been able to spend a week or ten days going over the records of, in particular, the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and Baylor University. This much, however, I do know: The Southern Association stimulated the conversion of a number of colleges, academies, and girls' finishing schools into junior colleges and, further, that Baylor University supplied the bifurcation motif.

The Civil War shockingly retarded southern education; and when the Southern Association began its accrediting activities in 1895, it found scores of private colleges and secondary schools which mocked the name of educational institutions. They had miniscule endowments, atrociously prepared teachers, no equipment worth favorable mention, and very small libraries of largely worthless books. The religious denominations that operated them, however, had strong desires to continue them in existence; and so with the blessing of the Southern Association they transformed them into junior colleges.

Among these unsatisfactory institutions were a number under Baptist auspices; and the Baptists decided to follow the leadership of the great Baptist university of the North, the University of Chicago, and federate them in a "correlated system" with Baylor University at the center of it. I can find no specific evidence that the Texas Baptists consciously followed Chicago or, indeed, that they knew about Harper's affiliation scheme; but it seems certain that they did. In any case, they organized the Texas Baptist Educational Commission and put a minister named Dr. Benajah Harvey Carroll at its head with instructions to nurse the "correlation system" into vigorous strength. Apparently he didn't succeed since the information that I have been able to gather leaves no question that the system never really got under way and eventually petered out.

As I say, I need to do more work on the history of Texas junior colleges, but it seems probable that additional information will confirm my present conclusion that most of the original private junior colleges of Texas came onto the scene because of the accreditation mvement, the bifurcation campaign, or both.

Missouri

Missouri, largely southern in its traditions and institutions, had much the same sort of educational situation as Texas; and there too accreditational activities and bifurcational ideas would prepare the way for junior colleges. John Carleton Jones, long-time professor of Latin at the University of Missouri and transitional president for two years in the early nineteen twenties, has described as follows the circumstances that led to their sponsorship by the University of Missouri:

> If we go back a generation in the history of education in Missouri, we shall find a condition that may very properly be called educational chaos. There was no cooperation whatsoever between the various grades of education in the State. The public high schools and the private academies ignored the colleges and were ignored in turn. The University maintained a preparatory department and exercised no more influence on the high schools of Missouri than on the high schools of Michigan. In the early nineties a movement was inaugurated by the University of Missouri to standardize and accredit high schools and academies. There were not more than a half dozen high schools in all Missouri at that time that could prepare students to meet the present requirements for admission to the University. A man was put into the field whose sole business it was to inspect such schools, to advise with principals in regard to their problems and to recommend for accrediting such schools as met his requirements. . . .
>
> During the same period the four-year colleges were standardized and formed the Missouri College Union, which now includes all the reputable four-year colleges and also three universities, Washington University, St. Louis University, and the University of the State.
>
> When the movement for standardizing high schools and academies and that for standardizing the four-year college had been worked out, there were left many private institutions that belonged to neither class. These colleges had been giving instruction beyond that of the secondary school, but less than was required to be rated as a standard college. For the most part they were weak, struggling church colleges, without endowment and depending upon tuition fees and gifts for their support. . . . You have no doubt seen their beautifully illustrated catalogs announcing courses that would have reflected credit upon a well-endowed university.

Jones refers in this statement to the accreditation activities of the University of Missouri in the early nineties. President Richard H. Jesse, who took office in 1891, initiated them and during his sixteen years in office nurtured them earnestly. A strong leader both at home and beyond the borders of Missouri, Jesse

served on the Committee of Ten, as chairman of the higher education section of the National Educational Association, and as president of the National Association of States Universities. He therefore knew a good deal about national developments in education, and throughout his presidential career he strongly advocated bifurcation. For example, in an N.E.A. address of 1892 he commented as follows upon the then-much-discussed question of reducing the length of the college course to three years:

> Prophecy is always risky for the reputation of the prophet; but does it not look as if this proposition, though temporarily rejected, must ultimately be accepted, and if the condition of life is progress, . . . may not three years of college curriculum be some day shortened to two, and finally abolished altogether? Then the examination for bachelor degrees in art and science would be held in the high schools and academies, as an American equivalent to the last examination of the Gymnasia, . . .

James Madison Wood, who graduated from the University of Missouri the year that Jesse resigned because of poor health (1907), has talked with me at length about Jesse's ideas. He came to know him well because Jesse lived near the campus until his death in 1921; and in 1912 Wood returned to Columbia, the seat of the University and also of Stephens College of which he that year became president.

President Jesse wanted the University of Missouri to drop the freshman and sophomore years not only because of the educational desirability of that procedure but also, as Mr. Wood tells me, because of the low state of sexual morality among University of Missouri students and among the students of other middle western state universities. None of these universities had dormitories, and the animus against fraternities and sororities had prevented them from furnishing residence for their members. Men and women students, therefore, lived in the same unsupervised boarding houses with results that shocked Jesse especially after he learned that the drug stores in the neighborhoods of the state universities were selling scandalously large quantities of the well-known contraceptive sheath called the condom. Jesse believed that this appalling situation could be corrected, first,

by permitting fraternities to house their members and second, by organizing junior colleges to keep freshmen and sophomores at home.

Jesse put his fraternity plan into action, but he resigned before he could do much about his junior college ideas. He appears, however, to have convinced his successor, A. Ross Hill, that he should encourage the twilight-zone colleges and academies cited in the Jones quotation above to become junior colleges. Hill needed little persuasion. He had been dean of the School of Education at Missouri during the last four years of Jesse's administration, and he therefore knew of Jesse's convictions. He also knew, as did Jesse, that in 1897 the University of Chicago had established the "title" of Associate in Arts, and he used this knowledge to help the junior colleges to achieve the dignity that they needed to prosper.

Hill became president of the University of Missouri in 1908, but he did not find it opportune to move upon the junior college problem until early in 1912 when one of the two twilight-zone institutions in Columbia found itself without a president and also on the verge of bankruptcy, namely, Stephens College, an institution whose history antedated that of the University. This situation presented him with his opportunity, and he had a strong leverage because the chairman of the Stephens Board of Curators was a fellow Canadian and also his successor as dean of the School of Education, W. W. Charters.

Charters did not yet know Wood well. He had joined the Missouri faculty the year of Wood's graduation, but he met him at educational meetings and knew him to be an extraordinarily energetic individual. After various teaching and administrative positions in southern Missouri Wood had gone, in 1910, for a year of graduate study at Teachers College Columbia University and returned to join the staff of the State Department of Education at Springfield. Acting for the Stephens board, Charters offered him the presidency; but Wood saw no hope for the college. It had less than three dozen students, a threatening debt, and a single dilapidated building. He turned the offer down.

Thereupon Hill entered the situation. He invited Wood to come up from Springfield for a talk. Wood's acceptance of the invitation changed the course of his life. Hill laid before him his junior college plans, told him that if he would accept the University of Missouri would accredit Stephens along with three other comparable institutions, and that he would back him in every possible way to build Stephens into a successful and prosperous junior college.

Wood saw and accepted the challenge. His spectacular success as Stephens' president for the next thirty-five years is so well known that even to mention it seems like supererogation. Cut from the same block as William Rainey Harper, Wood had promotional abilities the like of which only two or three educators a generation possess. His fabulous achievements at Stephens deserve being chronicled in a full-length biography if only because in the minds of most people he long personified the junior college movement.

Wood, it must be emphasized, remained faithful throughout his post-1912 career to the 6-4-4 plan, that is, to the structural pattern honored by the bifurcators. In 1916, for example, he espoused the plan in a major and widely quoted N.E.A. address, and he made a similar speeches throughout all the years of his administration. The new-type four-year college idea never took hold at Stephens, but Wood to this day believes that the universities should drop the freshman and sophomore years and thus lend their support to the 6-4-4 plan throughout the nation.

- - - - - - - - - - -

The history of the structuring of American education reviewed in these pages suggests that the 6-4-4 plan and, indeed, the bifurcation formula are both all-but-dead conceptions. Junior colleges, however, are very much alive; and I earnestly hope that soon someone building upon this memorandum will review their present status and potential future.

APPENDIX ONE

French and German University Structuring

Napoleon's decree of March 17, 1808 established five university faculties: the three medieval faculties of law, medicine, and theology and the new faculties of letters and of science. This structural plan split the medieval faculty of arts into two parts -- letters and science. Jefferson, however, went further and divided the French faculty of letters into two units (ancient languages and modern languages) and the faculty of science into three (mathematics, natural philosophy and chemistry). He made no provision for theology, but he added a faculty which Napoleon had neglected -- moral philosophy, that is, what we today call social science.

The French system rather than Jefferson's revision of it would continue to be influential in the United States -- and also quite restrictive -- until Columbia abandoned its remnants in 1909 and Yale in 1920. Meanwhile in 1876 John Hopkins made it standard practise for the great majority of American universities to follow the German plan of one faculty for all subjects other than law, medicine, theology, and the new professional subjects such as agriculture, engineering, and dentistry.

This may seem to be extraneous detail, and perhaps in a memorandum on the junior college it is. I have therefore put these remarks in an appendix which must be enlarged to add two further points, to wit, first, that in my opinion, we wisely followed Germany in the nineteenth century but, second, the French system as established at Columbia in 1880 (abandoned in 1909) and in operation at the University of Chicago since 1931 has infinitely greater utility for the United States in the mid-twentieth century. I hope to amplify this opinion in a later memorandum on the status and problems of graduate education. I cite it here as a sort of promissory note.

APPENDIX TWO

Sources Employed

Because Dr. Eurich asked that this memorandum be completed "with all due speed" during the summer of 1955, the sources employed in its writing could not be cited in footnotes. Interested readers, however, may find them in a dozen or so of my published writings and in a series of doctoral dissertations written under my direction and available from the Stanford University Library by interlibrary loan. The tapes made with Dr. Wood in 1954-55 may also be consulted by communicating with the Oral History Research Office at Columbia University. Upon the advice of Dr. Wood's former secretary, Miss Grace Pepperdine, I sent them there in the spring of 1962 because Stepehns College had not as yet organized archives for its historical records.

Relevant W. H. Cowley Publications:

"A Ninety-Year-Old Conflict Erupts Again." THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD, April 1942, pp. 192-218.

"The War on the College " ATLANTIC MONTHLY, June 1942, pp. 719-726.

"The Significance of the Harvard Report for Secondary Education." WESTERN COLLEGE ASSOCIATION ADDRESSES OF 1945, 5 pp.

"The Harvard Report -- A Review." HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, January 1946, pp. 56-71.

"Education for the Great Community." THE JOURNAL OF GENERAL EDUCATION, Vol. 1, No. 1, October 1946, pp. 22-33.

"The Government and Administration of Higher Education: Whence and Whither." JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS, July 1947, pp. 477-491.

"Some History and a Venture in Prophecy." TRENDS IN STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK, edited by E. G. Williamson, University of Minnesota Press, 1949, pp. 12-27.

"Thoughts on the Truman Report." THE JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION, June 1948, pp. 275-283 and 329.

"A Century of College Teaching." IMPROVING COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING, November 1953, pp. 3-10.

Review of THE BEGINNING OF GRADUATE EDUCATION IN AMERICA, by Richard J. Storr, University of Chicago Press, 1953. JOURNAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION, February 1954, pp. 104-05.

"The Heritage and Purposes of Higher Education." Proceedings of the 1954-55 Meetings of the Western College Association, pp. 53-61.

Relevant Stanford Doctoral Dissertations:

Beatty, Shelton L., "A Curricular History of Grinnell College, 1848-1931," 1955.

Corson, Louis D., "University Problems as Described in the Personal Correspondence Among D. C. Gilman, A. D. White, and C. W. Eliot," 1951.

Duryea, Edwin D., Jr., "Background and Development of Stanford Curricular Organization," 1948.

Engle, Gale, "William Rainey Harper's Conceptions of the Structuring of the Functions Performed by Educational Institutions," 1954.

Feliz, George C., "Organized Labor and Higher Education in the United States," 1949.

Lieuallen, Roy Elwane, "The Jeffersonian and Jacksonian Conceptions in Higher Education," 1965.

MacDonald, Franklin, "Conceptions of Leading Twentieth Century Educators Concerning the Relationship of Teaching and Research," 1950.

O'Byrne, Ernest B., "The Research Institutes of Stanford," 1951.

Perdue, James E., "James Bryant Conant's Conceptions of the Structuring of Educational Functions," 1952.

Peterson, Karl George, "Andrew Dickson White's Educational Principles: Their Sources, Development, Consequences," 1956.

Petteys, Manville R., "Professional Training and Licensing Practices in Law, 1750-1950," 1951.

Reed, Glenn, "Criticisms of the American Graduate School (1900-1945)," 1950.

Robinson, Chester H., "The Work of Eight Major Educational Associations Toward the Improvement of College Teaching, 1920-1940," 1950.

Smith, Edwin D., "Conceptions of Leading Nineteenth Century Educators Concerning the Relationship of Teaching and Research," 1949.

Ward, Robert H., "Efforts to Reduce the Length of the American College Course to Three Years," 1952.

Summersette, John F., "The Structure of the Atlanta University Center," 1952.

Wert, Robert J., "The Impact of Three Nineteenth Century Reorganizations Upon Harvard University," 1952.

Wilson, Lois Mayfield, "Henry Philip Tappan's Conceptions of the Structuring of University Functions," 1954.

Young, Kenneth E., "Who Can and Should Go to What Kind of College?" 1953.

Zunzer, Robert F., "Robert Maynard Hutchins' Conceptions of the Functions and Structures of Higher Education," 1951.

APPENDIX THREE

A Short Semantic Note Concerning the Condom

As observed on page 47 above, President Richard H. Jesse of the University of Missouri promoted junior colleges throughout Missouri and also dropped his opposition to fraternities and sororities as student residences upon his discovery that "the drug stores in the neighborhoods of state universities were selling scandalously large quantities of the well-known contraceptive sheath called the condom."

My long-time interest in semantics aroused my curiosity about how the sheath acquired its American name since the English, French, and probably other peoples use quite different designations. In late 1970, therefore, I wrote my fellow Dartmouth alumnus Philip B. Gove, editor of the third edition of Webster's New International Dictionary, and asked about the identity of the "Dr. Condom or Conton" cited in the WNID as the "18th century English physician, its reputed inventor." His associate, F. Stuart Crawford, replied that "no one has yet been able to verify the existence of the supposed eponymous Dr. Condom or Conton," that in 1708 the word was first used in English, and that it appeared nine years later in a treatise on venereal disease.

It seemed desirable to quest further, and hence I wrote the most authoritative historian of Renaissance medicine that appropriate inquiries told me of -- Professor Vern L. Bullough of San Fernando Valley State College in southern California. He responded as follows on November 13, 1970:

> I do not know who invented the condom. There is a model of the Egyptian God Bes in the Temple at Dendera, built in the time of the Ptolemies, wearing a sheath. This was published by G. Maspero, Agyptische Kunstgeschichte (Leipzig: Ubers Steindorff, 1889), p. 52. Antonnius Liberalis in his account of Pasiphae sleeping with Minos who killed all his mates because he ejaculated scorpions and snakes says that Pasiphae saved herself by forcing him to wear a condom made of a goat bladder. (Metamorphoses, 41.)

> Fallopius [1523-62] in his De morbo gallico, Ch. 89 on "De praeservatione a carie gallica," p. 52, claims to have invented a linen glans sheath as a protection against venereal disease, and it appears often after that.
>
> Generally it is stated that a Dr. Condom or Conton, a physician at the court of Charles II, invented it, but as far as I know no one has traced such a person. The word Condom first appeared in Daniel Turner, A PRACTICAL TREATISE ON THE VENEREAL DISEASE OR SYPHILIS, London 1717, p. 107 in 1732 edition, p. 74 in 1717 edition. Others have derived it from the accusative of condus, to conceal, protect, preserve. Norman Himes, MEDICAL HISTORY OF CONTRACEPTION gives some other possible explanations.

The few hours invested in this short study have paid a number of dividends: they have ended my curiosity about the word condom, clarified a minor but important fact of American social (and also educational) history, and provided me -- and perhaps others who read this memorandum -- a conversational tid-bit.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 6 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES